

For reasons I do not know, I no longer have an electronic copy of this speech.

WOMEN IN THE JUDICIARY

Panel Presentation - the 40th National Conference of Law Reviews
March 17, 1994, The Condado Plaza Hotel, Puerto Rico

When I finished law school in 1979, there were no women judges on the Supreme Court or on the highest court of my home state, New York. This past year alone there has been a quantum leap in the representation of women in the legal profession, and particularly in the judiciary. In addition to the appointment of the first female United States Attorney General, Janet Reno, and the election of the first female, and only Hispanic, President, Roberta Cooper Ramos, of the American Bar Association, an institution founded in 1878, we have seen the appointment of a second female justice on the Supreme Court, Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, the appointment of a female chief judge, Justice Judith Kaye, to the Court of Appeals, the highest state court of New York, and the appointment to that same court of a second female judge, also not insignificantly, the first hispanic, Judge Carmen Beauchamp Ciprack.

As of 1992, women sat on the highest courts of almost all of the states and the territories including Puerto Rico, who can claim with pride the service of my esteemed co-panelist, The Honorable Miriam Naveira de Rodon, Associate Judge of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. One Supreme Court, that of Minnesota, has

a majority of women justices.

As of September 1992, the total federal judiciary, consisting of circuit, district, bankruptcy and magistrate judges, was 13.4% women. As recently as 1965, the federal bench had had only three women serve. Judges who are women on the federal bench are likely to increase significantly in the near future since the New York Times reported on January 18, 1994, that 39% of President Clinton's nominations to the federal judiciary in his first year have been women and he has vowed to continue that statistical pace in his future nominations.

These figures and the recent appointments are heartwarming. Nevertheless, much still remains to happen. Let us not forget that between the appointment of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in 1981 and Justice Ginsburg in 1992, 11 years had passed. Similarly, between Justice Kaye's initial appointment as an associate judge to the New York Court of Appeal in 1983 and Judge Cipracks' appointment this past year, 10 years had also passed. Today, there are still two out of 13 circuit courts and about 53 out of 92 districts courts in which no women sit. There are no district women judges in the federal courts in at least 22 states. Our 13.4 percentage of the federal judiciary translates to only 199 female judges of a total of 1,484 judges in all

levels of the judiciary. Similarly, about 10 state supreme courts still have no women. Even on the courts which do have women, many have only one woman judge. Amalya Kearse, a black woman appointed in 1979, is still the only woman on the Second Circuit of New York. The second black woman to be nominated to a court of appeals. Judith W. Rogers, Chief Judge of the District of Columbia, was only recently named by President Clinton. The first hispanic female federal judges were only appointed in the fall of 1992. We had a banner year with 3 appointments -- myself in the S.D.N.Y. and two colleagues, Judges Baird and Gonzalez to districts in California. We this year will have a fourth female hispanic with the nomination and likely appointment of Martha Vasquez in New Mexico. Yet, we still have no female hispanic circuit court judges or no hispanic, male or female, US Supreme Court judge.

In citing these figure, I do not intend to engage you in or address the polemic discussion of whether the speed or number of appointments of women judges is commensurate with the fact that women have only entered the profession in any significant numbers in the last twenty years. Neither do I intend to engage in the dangerous and counterproductive discussion of whether the speed and number of appointments of

female judges is greater or lesser than that of people of color. Professor Stephen Carter of Yale Law School in his recent book on Affirmative Action points out that we excluded people do ourselves a disservice by comparative statistics or analysis. I accept and endorse his proposition that each of our experiences should be valued, assessed and appreciated independently.

I have, instead, raised these statistics as a base from which to discuss what my colleague Judge Miriam G. Cedarbaum of the S.D.N.Y. in a speech addressing "Women on the Federal Bench" and reprinted in Vol. 73 of the Boston University Law Review [page 39, at 42], described as "the difficulty question of what the history and statistics mean?" In her speech, Judge Cedarbaum expressed her belief that the number of women on the bench was still statistically insignificant and that therefore, we could not draw valid scientific conclusions from the acts of so few.

Yet, we do have women in more significant numbers on the bench, and no one can or should ignore asking and pondering what that will mean, or not mean, in the development of the law. I can not and do not claim this issue as personally my own. In recent years there has been an explosion of research and writing in this area. For those of you interested in the topic, I commend to you a wonderful compilation of articles written on the

subject in Volume 77 of Judicature, The Journal of the American Judicature Society for November-December 1993. This Journal is published out of Chicago, Illinois.

Judge Cedarbaum in her speech, however, expresses concern with any analysis of women on the bench which begins, and presumably ends, with a conclusion that women are different than men. She sees danger in presuming that judging should be gender or anything else based. She rightly points out that the perception of differences between men and women is what led to many paternalistic laws and to the denial to women of the right to vote because we could not "reason" or think "logically" but instead acted "intuitively".

While recognizing the potential effect of individual experiences on perceptions, Judge Cedarbaum nevertheless believes that judges must transcend their personal sympathies and prejudices and aspire to and achieve a greater degree of fairness and integrity based on the reason of law. From a person, who happens to be a women, like Judge Cedarbaum, one can easily see the genesis of her conclusions. She is a wonderful judge -- patient, kind, and devoted to the law. She is the epitome of fairness. She has been tremendously supportive of me this past year and a half and she serves as an example of what all judges

should aspire to be.

Yet, although I agree with and attempt to work toward Judge Cedarbaum's aspirations, I wonder whether achieving the goal is possible in all, or even most cases, and I wonder whether by ignoring our differences as women, men or even people of color, if differences exist, we do a disservice both to the law and society.

Just this month, the Supreme Court in Liteky v. United States, has recognized that personal bias and partiality are inherent in the task of judging. In deciding when judges should recuse themselves from cases, the Supreme Court recognized the existence of "appropriate" bias born of reactions that develop during a case from the facts of the case and "inappropriate" bias which stems from "extrajudicial" sources like information passed on by a non-party or ex parte, or from deep seated opinions that make fair judgment impossible. Justice Kennedy in his concurring opinion, joined by three other justices -- a split in our High Court, not something new -- expresses a concern similar to that voiced by Judge Cedarbaum which is that good and bad bias are impossible to determine because they depend so much on historical context and self-perception. Therefore, Justice Kennedy advocates a return to an objective standard in which what a reasonable

person would perceive as unbiased and impartial controls whether a judge disqualifies him or herself. I am not sure this is any less objectionable or more objective than Justice Scalia's majority approach in Liteky that presumed that a "reasonable person" could only be measured within the societal context with its current mores.

Whatever the reasons why we may have a different perspective as women -- either as some theorists suggest because of our cultural experiences or as others postulate like Prof Carol Gilligan of Harvard University in her book entitled In a Different Voice because we have basic differences in logic and reasoning, is in many respects a small part of the larger practical questions we as women judges and society in general must address. I accept Prof Carter's thesis in his Affirmative Action book that in any group of human beings, there is a diversity of opinions because there is both a diversity of experiences and of thought. Thus, as stated by Prof. Judith Resnik in her article in Vol. 61 of the S. Cal L. Rev. 1877 (1988), entitled On the Bias: Feminist Reconsideration of the Aspirations for Our Judges:

...there is not a single voice of feminism, not a feminist approach, but many who are exploring the possible ways of being that are distinct from those structured in a world

dominated by the power and words of men. Thus, feminist theories of judging are in the midst of creation and are not (and perhaps will never inspire to be) as solidified as the legal doctrine as the legal doctrines of judging can sometimes appear to be"

No one person, judge or nominee, will speak in a feminine or female voice. Yet, because I accept the proposition that, as Prof. Resnik explains, "to judge is an exercise of power" [pg 7] and because as Prof. Martha Minnow of Harvard Law School explains, there is no "objective stance but only a series of perspectives. ... [N]o neutrality, no escape from choice" [Resnik page 10] in judging, I further accept that our experiences as women will in some way affect our decisions. In short, as aptly stated by Prof. Minnow, "Th[e] aspiration to impartiality ... is just that an aspiration rather than a description because it may suppress the inevitable existence of a perspective" What that means to me is that not all women, in all or some circumstances, or me in any particular case or circumstances, but enough women, in enough cases, will make a difference in the process of judging.

The Minnesota Supreme Court has given us an example of this. As reported by Judge Wald in her article entitled Some Real-Life Observations about Judging contained in a comment in Vol. 26 of the Indiana Law Review 173 (1992), the three women on

that court, with the two men dissenting, agreed to grant a protective order against a father's visitation rights when the father abused his child. The Judicature Journal has at least two excellent studies on how women on the U.S. Court of Appeals and on state supreme courts have tended to vote more often than their male counterparts to support claimants in sex discrimination cases and more often in cases involving euphemistically as I refer to them "underdogs" like criminal defendants in search and seizure cases. In a another real life example, in the Menendez trial in California, a jury split six men to six women on whether a lesser verdict should be returned against a son charged, with his brother, in killing their parents. For those of you law students, particularly editors on law journals, lost in the bowels of the law library and intricacies of the Uniform Book on Legal Citations, the Menendez brothers defended the homicides as an act of despair generated by years of abuse. The state prosecuted on the theory of financial gain from the rather sizeable inheritance the brothers may collect if acquitted of the charge. Although the brothers were tried together, they were tried before two separate juries because certain evidence came in against one but not the other brother. Both juries hung but the press has been fascinated by the gender split in the Eric

Menendez verdict voting in which the women wished to acquit or at least bring in a verdict less than the highest count and the men did not.

As recognized by Professor Resnik, Judge Wald, and others, whatever the causes, not one women in any one position, but as a group, we will have an affect on the development of the law and on judging.

In private discussions with me on the topic of differences based on gender in judging, Judge Cedarbaum has pointed out to me that the seminal decisions in race and sex discrimination have come from Supreme Courts composed exclusively of white males. I agree that this is significant except I choose to emphasize that the people who argued the cases before the Supreme Court which changed the legal landscape were largely people of color and women. I recall that Justice Thurmond Marshall, Judge Constance Baker Motley from my court and the first black women appointed to the federal bench and others of the then NAACP argued Brown v. Board of Education. Similarly, Justice Ginsburg, with other women attorneys, was instrumental in advocating and convincing the court that equality of work required equality in the terms and conditions of employment. Whether born from experience or inherent physiological

differences, a possibility I abhor less or discount less than my colleague Judge Cedarbaum, our gender makes and will make a difference in our judging.

Justice O'Connor has often been cited as saying that "a wise old man and a wise old woman reach the same conclusion" in deciding cases. I am not so sure Justice O'Connor is the author of that line since Professor Resnik attributes the line to Supreme Court Justice Coyle. I am also not so sure that I agree with the statement. First, if Prof. Martha Minnow is correct, there can never be a universal definition of "wise." Second, I would hope that a wise woman with the richness of her experiences would, more often than not, reach a better conclusion. What is better?

I like Professor Resnik hope that better will mean a more compassionate, and caring conclusion. Justice O'Connor and my colleague Miriam Cedarbaum would likely say that in their definition of wise, these characteristics are present. Let us not forget, however, that wise men like Oliver Wendel Holmes and Cardozo voted on cases upholding both sex and race discrimination. That until 1972, no Supreme Court case ever upheld the right of a women in a gender discrimination case. I like Prof. Carter believe that we should not be so myopic as to

believe that others of different experiences or backgrounds are incapable of understanding the values of a different group. As Judge Cedarbaum pointed out, nine white men (or at least a majority) on the Supreme Court in the past have done so on many occasions for different issues. However, to understand takes time and effort, components not all people are willing to give. For others, their experiences limit their ability to identify. Yet others, simply do not care. In short, I accept the proposition that a difference there will be by the presence of women on the bench and that my experiences will effect the facts I choose to see as a judge. I hope that I will take the good and extrapolate it further into other areas than those with which I am familiar. I simply do not know exactly what that difference will be in my judging, but I accept there will be some based on my gender and the experiences it has imposed on me.

As pointed out by Elaine Martin in her forward to the Judicature volume:

Scholars are well placed, numbers-wise-to begin the proposition that the presence of women judges makes a difference in the administration of justice. Yet, a new set of problems arises for such researchers. Just what is meant by difference, and how is it measure? Furthermore, if differences exist, why do they exist and will they persist over time? In addition to these empirical questions, there are normative ones. Are these possible gender differences good or bad? Will they improve our system of

laws or harm it?

In summary, Prof. Martin quote informs me that my quest for answers is likely to continue indefinitely. I hope that by raising the questions today, you will start your own evaluations. For women lawyers, what does or should being a women mean in your lawyering. For men lawyers, what areas in your experiences and attitudes do you need to work on to make you capable of reaching those great moments of enlightenment which other men in different circumstances have been able to reach.?

For me, since Senator Moynihan sent my name to President Bush in March of 1990, as a potential federal judicial nominee, I have struggled with defining my judicial philosophy. The best I can say now four-and-a-half years later, one-half year since I assumed my responsibilities, is that I have yet to find a definition that satisfies me. I do not believe that I have failed in my endeavor because I do not have opinions or approaches but only because I am not sure today whether those opinions and approaches merit my continuing them. Each day on the bench, I learn something new about the judicial process and its meaning. I am reminded each day that I render decisions that affect people concretely and that I owe them constant and continuous vigilance in checking my assumptions, presumptions and

perspectives and ensuring that to the extent my limited abilities and capabilities permit me, that I reevaluate and change them as circumstances and cases before me require. I can and do, like my colleague Judge Cedarbaum, aspire to be greater than the sum total of my experiences but I accept my limitations, I willingly accept that we who judge must not deny the differences resulting from experience and gender but attempt, as the Supreme Court suggests, continuously to judge when those opinions, sympathies and prejudices are appropriate. There is always danger in relative morality but since there are choices we must make, let us make them by informing ourselves on the questions we must not avoid asking and continuously ponder.